

**MINUTES**  
**UTAH SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE CONTROL BOARD MEETING**  
**Utah Department of Environmental Quality**  
**168 North 1950 West, Building #2, (Conf. Room 101), SLC, Utah**

**October 13, 2005**

**Board Members Present:** Craig Anderson, (Chair), John Newman (Vice-Chair), Michael Brehm, Carlton Christensen, Kory Coleman, William Doucette, Craig Forster, Gary Mossor, Kevin Murray, Dianne Nielson, Dennis Riding.

**Staff Members Present:** Dennis Downs (Executive Secretary), Brad Johnson (Executive Secretary UST), Scott Anderson, Tom Ball, Brent Everett, Marty Gray, Barbara Johnson, Rusty Lundberg, Cheryl Prawl, Bill Rees, John Waldrup.

**Others Present:** Kris Snow, Trace Salmon, Jim Wilcox, Clint Warby, Fred Bonney, Mike Redd, Rick Rathbun.

**I. The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.**

**II. Approval of minutes for the September 8, 2005, Board meeting (Board Action Item)**

**It was motioned by John Newman and seconded by William Doucette and unanimously carried that the September 8, 2005, Board meeting minutes be approved.**

**III. Underground Storage Tanks Update**

Brad Johnson informed the Board that on September 28, 2005, representatives from the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) met with the Privatization Policy Board (Privatization Board) to confer about the Petroleum Storage Tank (PST) Fund and its possible privatization. At the meeting, an overview of the program was given and discussions took place regarding the administration of that fund. Ultimately, the issue was referred to the Utah Underground Storage Tank Advisory Task Force (UST Task Force). It was also recommended that the Division of Environmental Response and Remediation (DERR) continue to meet with the UST Task Force to come up with a recommendation to take back to the Privatization Board. The DERR will be working closely with Doug Richins, who is the Executive Secretary of the Privatization Board, over the next several months. An UST Task Force meeting has been scheduled for November 15, 2005, in which this issue will be the primary topic of discussion.

Craig Anderson asked where this meeting would be held. Mr. Johnson stated that the meeting will take place at 1:00 p.m. in room 201 at the UDEQ Building #2, 168 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mr. Johnson also informed the Board that the DERR has received the PST Fund Actuarial Report for fiscal year 2005. There were no surprises in the report as it still projects that the fund will run out of cash sometime in fiscal year 2008. It is expected that the fund will have approximately 1.7 million at the beginning of that fiscal year. The cash balance of the fund in September 2004 was 8.5 million dollars. As of August 2005, the cash balance was 8.4 million dollars. However, in April 2005, the balance was 7.2 million dollars. The fund has been fluctuating and is not declining as fast as previously thought, but it is still anticipated that with the current workload of the DERR, the cash balance will continue to decline as major projects are coming up. The DERR will continue to do what it can to control costs.

Dennis Riding inquired if the Actuarial Report for 2005 provides a little buffer from the 2004 report, or if there is no change at all. Mr. Johnson explained that there is a small buffer. The 2005 Actuarial Report predicts a slightly higher cash balance at the end of fiscal year 2007 than the 2004 Actuarial Report did. Mr. Johnson then stated that he would provide the Board members with a copy of the Actuarial Report.

Mr. Riding then questioned as to what kind of recommendation the Privatization Board looking for, such as pro or con sort of recommendation. Mr. Johnson stated that based upon his one meeting with the Privatization Board, it appears they are looking for a “thumbs-up/thumbs-down” or a specific concrete recommendation to be made.

Michael Brehm then asked what percentage of the budget goes to labor versus materials, and does the Actuarial Report take that into account. Mr. Johnson stated that he was not sure about the percentage, but that the DERR would look into the question and determine if the information is available. As for the Actuarial Report, it does not make those kinds of distinctions, but just looks at the overall expenses and projects information based on statistical models and trends based upon what has been done in the past. The Actuarial Report also states that it does not take into consideration changes in fuel costs.

#### **IV. Approval of Clandestine Drug Lab Decontamination Specialist Rules (Board Action Item)**

Bill Rees, Project Manager for the DERR, presented this Board Action item as a follow-up to the July 2005 Board meeting. During his presentation, Mr. Rees provided a brief update relative to the three primary issues discussed during that meeting: 1) Proposed Rules R311-500 and R311-501, 2) Decontamination Specialist Training Manual, and 3) the schedule for program implementation.

With respect to the rules, Mr. Rees explained that the Board approved modifications to the Clandestine Drug Lab Decontamination Specialist Rules and the request to go to a formal public comment period as part of the rule-making process during the July meeting. The comment period was initiated on August 15, 2005, and was completed on September 14, 2005. No comments were received.

Also during that time, a copy of the Decontamination Specialist Training Manual was forwarded to the expanded stakeholder committee for review. A few comments were received from the Salt Lake Valley Health Department, as well as the Utah Department of Health. The comments were minor in nature and were incorporated into the final document.

It was also proposed in the July Board meeting that the training manual would be finalized in early October, and applications would be accepted in mid-October in order to conduct the first certification testing in late October. The DERR is on schedule at this time to meet this schedule. The training manual was finalized on October 6, 2005, and is currently available at Alpha Graphics for public purchase upon adoption of the rules by the Board. In addition, the DERR is ready to accept applications beginning October 17, 2005, with the first certification exam scheduled for October 28, 2005. In order to proceed, the Board is requested to approve and adopt R311-500 and R311-501 as part of the rule-making process.

William Doucette then stated that with the decontamination specialist certification being good for a 2-year period, the applicant must also meet the Occupational Safety and Health Administration/Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) requirement, which is renewed annually. Mr. Doucette questioned that with these two different time frames, is it possible for someone to let their HAZWOPER requirement lapse during the time they are certified as a decontamination specialist. Mr. Rees explained that this is a possibility, but that in the Performance Standards (R311-500-8) that are set

forth in the rule, there is a requirement to maintain the necessary certifications. If the decontamination specialist were to let this requirement lapse, their certification as a decontamination specialist could be revoked as specified in R311-500-9.

Carlton Christensen then expressed his appreciation and gratitude to the DERR staff for working diligently in preparing the decontamination specialist certification rules.

It was motioned by Carlton Christensen and seconded by Kory Coleman, and unanimously carried that the Clandestine Drug Lab Certification Program Rules (R311-500 and R311-501) be approved.

## **V. Solid Waste Section – Waste Tire Program Overview**

Rusty Lundberg made a presentation on Utah's Waste Tire Program. (A copy of the presentation is available with the meeting minutes.)

Dennis Downs stated that Division staff will occasionally provide presentations to the Board on the various Division programs.

The following information on Utah's Waste Tire Program was presented. Utah's Waste Tire Recycling Act was first enacted by the state Legislature in 1990 with the intent of creating a recycling market for waste tires generated in the State and those tires currently in piles, reduce the health and safety hazards posed by existing stockpiles of waste tires, decrease the number of tires disposed of in landfills, and encourage development of the tire recycling industry. In the past, several tire piles have burned resulting in environmental pollution and risk to the public. Tire dumps are also excellent breeding grounds for disease carrying mosquitoes.

The Division's Solid Waste Section has responsibility for the waste tire recycling program in Utah which includes registration of tire recyclers and tire transporters, review of reimbursement requests for transportation of tires from tire piles at landfills and abandoned piles, and enforcement of the Utah Administrative Code covering the storage of tires. The Division also maintains lists of registered tire recyclers and registered tire transporters.

The Act also provides rebates for tires recycled. To fund this program, the Utah Legislature imposed a recycling fee on the purchase of each new tire from a tire retailer by a consumer. The fee currently set by the Legislature is \$1.00 per tire. The recycling fees, paid by the consumer, are collected by the retailer and paid, on the same schedule as sales tax, either quarterly or annually, to the Utah State Tax Commission where they are placed into the Waste Tire Recycling Fund.

Money in the fund is used for partial reimbursement of the costs of transporting, processing, recycling, or disposing of waste tires. It may also be used to pay administrative costs to local health departments and other state agencies for their efforts in meeting requirements of the waste tire program. The fund balance is approximately \$1 million dollars.

The Waste Tire Recycling Act requires certain management practices relating to transportation, storage and disposal of waste tires. It also sets up a program to partially reimburse recyclers that use waste tires for energy recovery, such as cement kiln fuel or in a product like rubberized asphalt, mats, and ground cover in playgrounds. Processors that create products for beneficial use, such as alternative daily cover material for landfills, may also be partially reimbursed. Most of Utah's waste tires come from the Wasatch Front. The bulk of the waste tires recycled come from passenger cars, light trucks and large over-the-road trucks (eighteen wheelers). Larger tires are not eligible for the recycling reimbursement.

The number of Utah waste tires being recycled annually has significantly increased since 1991. There are approximately 65 passenger car tires in a ton. Addition information on Utah's Waste Tire Program can be found on the Department of Environmental Quality's web page [www.deq.utah.gov](http://www.deq.utah.gov) or by contacting the Division.

Michael Brehm asked if figures were available to determine how many waste tires are recycled each year versus the tonnage sold. Mr. Lundberg stated that there is not a way to tie those two figures together, but approximately

two million used tires are generated annually and all of the waste tires produced in Utah are recycled or processed within the state at the five registered waste tire recyclers.

Carlton Christensen asked how the Division verifies that waste tire recyclers are indeed recycling the tires they receive and what kind of a verification process is used. Mr. Lundberg stated that Division staff visit the recycling facilities and each waste tire recycler facility is required to submit paperwork for reimbursement that documents the volume of tires recycled and other pertinent information. Carlton Christensen stated that there is a tire recycler facility within his community that is located close to a residential area, and was concerned that a zoning error occurred. Mr. Carlton also questioned if there are environmental standards and regulations imposed on these waste tire recyclers. Mr. Lundberg stated the Division is aware of concerns for the specific facility, which include air quality issues. Unfortunately, as new tire recycling facilities come on line, there has been no recognition of zoning ordinances.

Michael Brehm pointed out that the number of tires being generated versus the number of tires being recycled is estimated to be equal and asked if that is a coincidence or is the demand for the recycled product higher and could the market actually take more. Mr. Lundberg stated the program is geared to handle Utah tires, so if marketers are hauling in tires from out of state they are not receiving reimbursement from Utah's program because the program only reimburses tire recycling facilities for waste tires that are generated in Utah. Mr. Lundberg further stated that he does believe the market could handle more tires, and some tire recycling facilities are hauling tires in from out of the state, but they are not claiming reimbursement on those tires. Mr. Brehm asked how Utah's program compares to the surrounding states, and whether we pay more or less. Mr. Lundberg stated that Utah is one of few states that assesses a fee and also provides reimbursements to support the program. Utah has one of the more successful programs throughout the country, because of the sustaining fee and the reimbursement. Mr. Brehm asked if Utah's tire recycling facilities are importing tires. Mr. Lundberg stated that some tire recycling facilities are bringing tires in from neighboring states to process. The exact volume is not known.

Fred Bonney, President of Tire Disposal and Recycling, stated that he receives some tires in from Wyoming, but the paperwork is kept separate and he charges Wyoming the equivalent of what the State of Utah would pay. Mr. Bonney stated it is a very transparent system and open to inspection at any time. Mr. Bonney stated that the tires are brought to Utah because the cost of putting recycling equipment in the other surrounding states is not economically feasible.

William Doucette asked about beneficial use and whether landfill cover is the primary use. Mr. Lundberg stated that landfill cover is the primary use. Mr. Bonney further stated that he preferred not to take tires to the landfill as it is not cost effective. The establishment of other markets is the main challenge.

## **VI. Used Oil Section**

### **A. Proposed Stipulation and Consent Agreement between the Board and Thermo Fluids, Inc. (Board Action Item)**

Cheryl Prawl reviewed the Proposed Stipulation and Consent Order No. 0507020 (SCO) between the Board and Thermo Fluids, Inc. Thermo Fluids, Inc. is currently permitted as a used oil processor, transporter, and marketer in Utah. On February 23, 2005, a complaint was received by the Division stating that Thermo Fluids was currently operating out of its new used oil processing facility that had not yet been permitted by the Executive Secretary. Division inspectors investigated and confirmed that used oil was being stored at the unpermitted facility. This discovery led to the issuance of a Notice of Violation No. 0504012 (NOV) on July 19, 2005 for operating a used oil processing facility without a permit. Thermo Fluids management admitted that it knowingly filled the tanks in the unpermitted facility. Thermo Fluids had a customer who had a large amount of oil that needed to be stored and because Thermo Fluids' other tanks at its existing facilities were filled, they had no other option but to store the oil in tanks at the un-permitted facility. Thermo Fluids did obtain a permit for the new Salt Lake City used oil-processing facility on June 17, 2005.

To resolve the NOV, a proposed SCO has been negotiated with Thermo Fluids. Under the terms of the proposed SCO, Thermo Fluids will pay a penalty of \$15,660. The 30-day public comment period began on August 30,

2005 and ended on September 28, 2005. No comments were received. The Division recommended that the Board approve the proposed SCO.

Carlton Christensen asked if the facility proceeded knowingly or unknowingly. Ms. Prawl stated that the facility proceeded knowingly. Ms. Prawl also stated that it was a business decision to accept the used oil, as Thermo Fluids had stated that they didn't want to lose the existing customer. Carlton Christensen asked if the penalty was assessed higher because the facility knowingly committed the violation. Ms. Prawl stated the penalty calculation included an adjustment for storing the oil and filling the tanks in the unpermitted facility despite knowing it was a violation of the used oil rules. Ms. Prawl clarified that during this time, Thermo Fluids had submitted their permit application to the State, had secondary containment, new tanks, and reclamation surety and liability insurance had been established. Therefore, if a spill had occurred, it would have been covered. Dennis Riding asked what the turnaround time for permits is. Cheryl Prawl stated that including the two-week public comment period, the turnaround time for a permit approval is approximately three months.

**It was motioned by William Doucette and seconded by Dennis Riding and unanimously carried that the proposed Stipulation and Consent Order No. 0507020 to resolve the Notice of Violation No. 0504012 issued to Thermo Fluids, Inc. on July 19, 2005, be approved.**

**B. Proposed changes to the Utah Used Oil Management Rules (Board Action Item)**

Cheryl Prawl explained that the Division is proposing changes to the used oil management rules, Standards for the Management of Used Oil (R315-15), to become equivalent to corresponding federal regulations. The Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) provides delegation of the used oil management program to states to administer in lieu of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In order to maintain authorization from EPA for the used oil management program, states must have and demonstrate equivalent legal authorities and regulations to those of the federal government for the management of used oil. The federal hazardous waste laws and regulations require states to update and amend their laws and rules in order to maintain program equivalency for state primacy. There are three areas within Utah's rules where secondary containment requirements are addressed. To make them equivalent to the federal regulations the phrase "or... An equivalent secondary containment system" must be added. The Division recommends that the Board approve the proposed changes for public comment.

Craig Forster asked what constitutes an equivalent secondary containment system. Ms. Prawl stated that at this point one has not been seen, but it could consist of an engineered clay liner. Currently, concrete is the industry standard and is what the Executive Secretary has been approving. At this time, no one has come forward with an engineered clay liner to be approved. This rule change would give industry the option to propose that. Mr. Forster asked what type of criteria would be used to determine if it is equivalent. Ms. Prawl stated that the federal rules do not specify equivalency requirements, but leave it up to the states to decide.

Michael Brehm asked if the original omission was concise and if so, what was the intent. Ms. Prawl stated that the original omission was a concise decision, as the Division was afraid that liners would not be properly installed, etc., and at this point, the State of Utah is being more stringent than the federal regulations. Ms. Prawl stated that it has been decided to give the option to industry that if they want to propose something that is approvable.

Kevin Murray asked if the determination to make the change is in the best interest of the Division as he does not see it as a legal requirement. Concerns with the State of Utah being more stringent than the federal requirements were briefly discussed. Ms. Prawl stated that House Bill 57 states that the State of Utah cannot be more stringent than federal regulations unless tests, studies, health effects, etc. can conclusively support the claim. Ms. Prawl stated the Division does not have a problem having this option available for industry.

Dennis Riding asked what other states and other regions experiences have been where this option has been in their regulations. Ms. Prawl stated that for most other states and regions, concrete has been the industry standard. Ms. Prawl stated that other states may be allowing clay liners, etc., but she is not aware of any at this time.

Dianne Nielson stated the rule is what it is and if it is more stringent that what is required in the federal law the time for opposing it has gone. Furthermore, House Bill 57 does provide that the State of Utah can be more stringent, but in taking that action supporting documentation needs to be provided for the record. Ms. Nielson stated that there is not any discussion of the component of the dike, berm, or retaining wall rule. Ms. Nielson asked if the Division was receiving pressure to change the rule or has it just been pointed out that it is not consistent with the federal rule. Dennis Downs stated that he believed that EPA did have a concern with the rule and requested Ms. Prawl to clarify the issue. Ms. Prawl stated that the EPA identified the rule last year as more stringent than the federal rules. Hence, the Division is trying to fix the rules. Ms. Prawl stated that no pressure has been received from industry to change the rule. Ms. Nielson stated that there is no requirement from EPA to change the rule. Ms. Prawl agreed and stated that EPA is merely making the suggestion. Rusty Lundberg stated that the review was done under EPA's rule for codification of the State's rules under the Code of Federal Regulations and this rule was highlighted for being not equivalent with corresponding federal regulations. So, if the decision is not to incorporate the changes, a demonstration or additional information will need to be provided to the EPA as to why the State of Utah is not equivalent to the corresponding federal regulations.

Michael Brehm asked whose authority is it, if this change is implemented, to determine equivalency. Ms. Prawl stated the authority is with the Executive Secretary. Michael Brehm stated the possible solution might be to adopt the changes, but then clarify within the program how to proceed or leave it out. Ms. Prawl stated that the State of Utah does issue permits as a state requirement, and that is where the Executive Secretary's authority would come in to either approve or disapprove the equivalent technology because it would be part of the permit.

John Newman stated that Board action is needed to allow the process to move forward to begin the formal public comment period. Mr. Newman stated that possibly in the formal public comment period additional information may be presented that might persuade the Board's final action. Ms. Neilson stated that all the information received from EPA states that this is a different sort of a rule. If approval is made to go to public comment on this rule change, but the proposed change is not adopted, does it then have to be justified why the State of Utah's rules have to be more stringent than EPA's. At this point, that justification does not need to be made. Raymond Wixom stated he believes that by initiating the rule making process, the Board will not be triggering any more requirements than already exists. If the Board chooses to do so, it can direct that this rule be approved for the public comment period without making any decisions regarding promulgating this rule.

**It was motioned by John Newman and seconded by William Doucette and unanimously carried that the proposed changes to the Utah Used Oil Management Rules (R315-15) be approved for the formal rulemaking process and begin the 30 day public comment period without any bias from the Board regarding this rule.**

## **VII. Chemical Demilitarization**

### **A. TOCDF Update**

Marty Gray stated that TOCDF is continuing with its cleanup and change-over operations. TOCDF completed the processing of the VX hydrolysate ton containers. However, in completing the process, two additional ton containers were found that were used during the VX hydrolysate testing. These two additional ton containers have been processed, thus completing the VX hydrolysate mission.

Earlier this year the Board approved a variance for soil cover over a hazardous waste landfill at Dugway. The progress is moving along and will be completed in the near future. The corrective action and the closure of all old waste piles and landfills have been progressing very rapidly at Dugway.

For the past month, Division staff has been conducting their annual inspection at Deseret Chemical Depot. The inspection was completed on September 30, 2004. On October 4, 2005, the Executive Secretary issued a letter to CAMDS that highlighted some deficiencies that were found throughout this year's inspection. The noted deficiencies required immediate attention. CAMDS was ordered to respond to these issues by October 21, 2005. CAMDS' response was to include their ability to comply with the permit, how they would comply, and identify areas where they may not be able to come into compliance with the requirements of the permit. Also, CAMDS

was required to explain their ability to operate the facility in a safe manner. Two days after the letter was sent out, Colonel Van Pelt, informed the Division that he has shut down operations at CAMDS while they evaluate the letter and the deficiencies. Therefore, at this time, CAMDS is not performing their waste sorting operations and their closure operations. These functions have ceased, including the metal parts furnace, except for the burning of spent decontamination solution. The Division is continuing to work with CAMDS to ensure that all issues are being addressed. Dennis Downs stated that Division staff will be going to the CAMDS facility in November to provide additional training on their permit requirements to ensure that the Division's concerns are being met.

Carlton Christensen questioned if the shut down was initiated by CAMDS commanding officer. Mr. Gray stated it may be a result of the letter, but the State did not force CAMDS to shut down. Board members requested the timeline of the events. Marty Gray stated the inspection date ended September 30, 2005, the letter was sent out on October 4, 2005 and the commanding officer ceased operations at CAMDS on October 6, 2005. The CAMDS facility does have approximately 10 days left to respond to the letter. Dennis Downs stated that CAMDS more than likely will be submitting a request for addition time to respond. Mr. Downs stated because CAMDS has ceased operations at the facility, the request for addition time does not deal with immediate safety issues, it is anticipated that the Division will approve the request for the extension.

#### **B. Judicial Consent Decree between the Board and DCD, CAMDS, and TOCDF (Board Action Item)**

Tom Ball reviewed the Judicial Consent Decree. Mr. Ball stated that in February 2005, a Notice of Violation (NOV) No. 0411037 was issued to Deseret Chemical Depot (DCD), the Chemical Agent Munitions Disposal System (CAMDS), and the Tooele Chemical Agent Disposal Facility (TOCDF). Both TOCDF and CAMDS are located within the boundaries of DCD. All three facilities have permits and must comply with state and federal laws regarding hazardous waste. One NOV is issued to all three facilities because they all operate under one EPA ID Number. The NOV contained 78 violations that were documented through self-reports from the facilities and during inspections performed by Division staff. A total penalty of \$125,115 has been calculated and agreed upon for settlement of the NOV. All violations cited in the NOV have been corrected or will be corrected through orders in the settlement. TOCDF has requested that this settlement be in the form of a Judicial Consent Decree as has been done in the past. DCD and CAMDS have no objection to this mechanism.

The public comment period for this settlement began on August 16, 2005 and ended on September 14, 2005. No comments were received.

The Judicial Consent Decree process was explained by Raymond Wixom, Assistant Attorney General, at the September meeting.

**It was motioned by William Doucette and seconded by Michael Brehm and unanimously carried that Judicial Consent Decree for settlement of Notice of Violation No. 0411037 issued to Deseret Chemical Depot (DCD), the Chemical Agent Munitions Disposal System (CAMDS), and the Tooele Chemical Agent Disposal Facility (TOCDF) be approved and request the Attorney General's Office to file a complaint.**

### **VIII. Other Business**

#### **A. FY07 Fees for DEQ**

Dennis Downs explained that the Utah Department of Environmental Quality has completed a draft of the 2007 fiscal year Fee Schedule for the Department. Each year, each Division is required to review their fee schedule to see if any changes need to be implemented. The Fee Schedule has to go through the legislative process and will be approved by the legislature. As part of the process, a public hearing is required to be held. The public hearing for UDEQ's fee schedule was held on September 23, 2005.

Mr. Downs stated that the Division has two changes that will be implemented. Those two changes deal with (1) the hourly fee applied to permit renewal (2) a filing fee for a \$1,000 for a hazardous waste permit renewal, to assist with processing the permit. Dianne Nielson stated the fee schedule will be submitted with the Governor's budget to the legislature. A copy of the Draft Fee Schedule is available on UDEQ's website at <http://www.deq.utah.gov/draft-fy07-feeschedule.pdf>

- B. Previous discussions included Board members touring the Envirocare Facility and the two Clean Harbors Facilities. The tour has been scheduled to take place on November 15, 2005. Mr. Downs stated that at this time, two Board members have expressed an interest in touring those facilities and if other Board members are interesting in attending, please contact him. (Board members not present will be polled to see if they are interested in touring these facilities.)

A tour was of the Deseret Chemical Depot was conducted on October 4, 2005. Board members attending the tour stated that the facility staff was very accommodating and the tour of the facility was very interesting. The also stated that by actually touring the facility they will have a better sense of the issues being discussed regarding the facility.

The possibility of canceling the December meeting was briefly discussed. Traditionally the Board does not meet in December. Division staff will be polled to see if there is a need for a meeting to occur.

Board members requested a legislative report on anticipated upcoming legislation activity at the next Board meeting.

Raymond Wixom stated that neither he nor Rick Rathbun would be able to attend the November Board meeting, as they will be involved in an Attorney General's conference.

The next meeting of the Utah Solid and Hazardous Waste Control Board will be held on November 10, 2005, at 1:00 p.m. in the DEQ Conference Room 101, located at 168 N. 1950 W., (Bldg. #2), SLC.